

1 Sarah E. Piepmeier, Bar No. 227094  
2 SPiepmeier@perkinscoie.com  
3 Elise Edlin, Bar No. 293756  
4 EEdlin@perkinscoie.com  
5 PERKINS COIE LLP  
505 Howard Street, Suite 1000  
6 San Francisco, California 94105  
7 Telephone: +1.415.344.7000  
8 Facsimile: +1.415.344.7050

9 [Additional counsel listed on signature page]

10 *Attorneys for Defendant NETFLIX, INC.*

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
12 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

13 LAURI VALJAKKA,

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 NETFLIX, INC.,

17 Defendant.

18 **Case No. 4:22-cv-01490-JST**

19 **JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT**  
20 **CONFERENCE STATEMENT**

21 Judge: Hon. JON S. TIGAR

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 Plaintiff Lauri Valjakka (“Valjakka”) and Defendant Netflix, Inc. (“Netflix”) (collectively  
 2 “the Parties”) hereby submit this Joint Case Management Statement pursuant to the Court’s Order,  
 3 Dkt. No. 324.

4 **I. JURISDICTION AND SERVICE**

5 This is a patent infringement action under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of  
 6 the United States Code. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28  
 7 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a) because this action involves claims arising under the patent laws of  
 8 the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1, et seq. This Court has jurisdiction over Netflix’s CUVTA  
 9 counterclaim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

10 The Parties do not contest that this Court has personal jurisdiction over the Parties or that  
 11 venue is proper and convenient.

12 **II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

13 **Netflix’s Statement**

14 On January 8, 2024, this Court granted Netflix’s motion for summary judgment, finding  
 15 that Mr. Valjakka did not have standing to assert his only remaining patent, the ’167 Patent.

16 On September 21, 2023, this Court granted Netflix’s Motions For a Preliminary Injunction  
 17 and for Motion To Amend The Schedule To Allow California Uniform Voidable Transactions  
 18 Act (“CUVTA”) Discovery. Dkt. Nos. 127, 129, 202, and 204. Specifically, on September 28,  
 19 2023, the Court granted Netflix’s request for CUVTA discovery from Mr. Valjakka, “Netflix may  
 20 take the following discovery: (i) one three (3) hour deposition of Valjakka limited to the CUVTA  
 21 issue, (ii) one three (3) hour deposition of CDN Licensing’s CEO limited to the CUVTA issue,  
 22 (iii) a single discovery request seeking documents related to the formation and purpose of CDN  
 23 Licensing, (iv) five (5) interrogatories limited to the CUVTA issue, and (v) five (5) requests for  
 24 admission limited to the CUVTA issue.” Dkt. No. 183. Netflix has now completed its CUVTA  
 25 discovery.

26 While reviewing documents produced by AiPi, Netflix became aware that Mr. Ramey and  
 27 Ramey LLP had violated the Protective Order. On February 18, 2025, Netflix filed a Motion For  
 28

1 An Order To Show Cause And Sanctions Against Plaintiff's Former Attorney, William Ramey  
 2 and Ramey LLP. ECF 302. On July 10, 2025, the Court granted in part and denied in part  
 3 Netflix's motion. Specifically, the Court granted the motion for Rule 37 sanctions and allowed  
 4 additional discovery into Mr. Ramey and Ramey LLP's Protective Order Violations. ECF 324.  
 5 Netflix completed additional discovery after taking Mr. Ramey's deposition on August 19, 2025  
 6 and submitted its Supplemental Brief on September 2, 2025. ECF 333.

7 On August 21, Netflix filed a Motion for Summary Judgment on Netflix's claim under the  
 8 CUVTA. ECF 329. On August 25, 2025, Mr. Valjakka filed a Motion for Summary Judgment  
 9 Dismissing Netflix's CUVTA Counterclaim. ECF 330. The parties are briefing these motions,  
 10 and the hearing is scheduled for October 2, 2025.

11 **Valjakka's Statement**

12 Plaintiff Lauri Valjakka respectfully disagrees with Netflix's characterization of the case.  
 13 While the Court found that Plaintiff lacked standing to assert the '167 Patent, Plaintiff maintains  
 14 that the patent was properly revived and prosecuted based on formal legal opinions and procedural  
 15 history, including a statement from Professor Jarno Tepora and confirmation from the Finnish  
 16 bankruptcy estate attorney that the patent was never inventoried or claimed.

17 Plaintiff notes that the Supreme Court of Finland recently returned the matter to the  
 18 Helsinki District Court for further evaluation, despite counterclaims raised by the bankruptcy  
 19 estate attorney. While the title issue remains pending, this development provides an opportunity  
 20 for formal correction. Plaintiff does not claim final resolution but emphasizes that the estate  
 21 attorney himself confirmed the patent was never part of the bankruptcy inventory. As the  
 22 invention, inventor, and all relevant facts concerning title are Finnish, the jurisdiction for  
 23 determining ownership resides exclusively with the Finnish courts.

24 Plaintiff further notes that the PTAB terminated Netflix's IPR petition on the '167 Patent  
 25 and denied Netflix's request to enter adverse judgment against the Patent Owner. These rulings  
 26 are material and support Plaintiff's good-faith enforcement efforts.

27  
 28

1 Plaintiff also emphasizes that Netflix was made aware of the patent and its scope as early  
 2 as 2014, through direct correspondence with Netflix's representative, Mr. Peters. This prior  
 3 knowledge is relevant to the factual context of the case and to Plaintiff's position regarding  
 4 transparency and intent.

5 On August 25, 2025, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Summary Judgment dismissing Netflix's  
 6 CUVTA counterclaim (ECF No. 330), supported by financial records, procedural history, and  
 7 legal analysis. On September 15, 2025, Plaintiff filed a Declaration with supporting exhibits,  
 8 including PTAB rulings and Finnish legal documents, to further clarify the factual context and  
 9 rebut Netflix's allegations. These filings reflect Plaintiff's continued good-faith participation and  
 10 commitment to transparency.

11 Plaintiff disputes the factual and legal basis of Netflix's CUVTA counterclaim and  
 12 maintains that all transfers were made in good faith, prior to any claim or threat, and were  
 13 executed by a third party—not by Plaintiff himself. Plaintiff has consistently acted with  
 14 procedural integrity and financial openness throughout the litigation.

15 **Ramey Statement**

16 William P. Ramey, III, will attend the CMC to argue that no attorneys fees or expenses  
 17 should be paid to Netflix.

18 **III. DISPUTED LEGAL ISSUES**

19 **Netflix's Statement**

20 For the purpose of the CMC alone, there are no disputed legal issues. Netflix currently  
 21 has Counterclaims for Inequitable Conduct and Unclean Hands, which will not be addressed at  
 22 the Summary Judgment stage.

23 **Valjakka's Statement**

24 Mr. Valjakka contest whether, given the status of the case, Netflix's counterclaims for  
 25 inequitable conduct and unclean hands are still alive. The Court's invalidation of the '102 patent  
 26 and the Court's finding that Mr. Valjakka does not own the '167 patent is believed to obviate the  
 27 remaining counterclaims as no assertion by Valjakka is possible. While Netflix has stated the  
 28

1 defenses of inequitable conduct and unclean hands as counterclaims, both are defenses to an  
2 action that is no longer pending. Further, the August 28, 2025, court decision from Finland that  
3 reverses then finding that Mr. Valjakka did not own the '167 patent directly impacts Netflix's  
4 alleged counterclaims. A stay is warranted until a new decision issues from Finland concerning  
5 ownership of the '167 patent.

6 **IV. MOTIONS**

7 The outstanding motions are:

8

- 9 • Netflix's CUVTA motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 329);
- 10 • Valjakka's motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 330); and
- 11 • Netflix's Supplemental Brief Regarding Expenses and Fees (ECF No. 333).
- 12 • Netflix also intends to file a motion for attorneys' fees.

13 **V. AMENDMENT OF PLEADINGS**

14 None.

15 **VI. EVIDENCE PRESERVATION**

16 The Parties have filed a stipulated Protective Order. ECF No. 56.

17 Netflix's Statement

18 Netflix timely issued a litigation hold to individuals related to this action.

19 **VII. DISCLOSURES**

20 The Parties served initial disclosures on May 31, 2022, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26.

21 Netflix then served amended initial disclosures on July 1, 2022.

22 **VIII. DISCOVERY**

23 Discovery is complete.

24 **IX. CLASS ACTION**

25 This case is not a class action.

26 **X. RELATED CASES**

27 The '167 patent and the '102 patent were also at issue in the following related proceedings

28 in Western District of Texas: *Valjakka v. Cisco Systems, Inc.*, Case No. 6:21-cv-00944; *Valjakka*

1 *v. Amazon.com, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 6:21-cv-00945; *Valjakka v. Apple, Inc.*, Case No. 6:22-cv-  
2 00003; *Valjakka v. Google LLC*, Case No. 6:22-cv-00004; *Valjakka v. Intertrust Tech. Corp.*,  
3 Case No. 6:22-cv-00234; *Valjakka v. Philips North America LLC*, Case No. 6:22-cv-00226; and  
4 *Valjakka v. Sony Interactive Entertainment LLC*, Case No. 6:22-cv-00005. Those proceedings  
5 have now settled.

6 Netflix also filed a petition for inter partes review of the '167 patent on September 23,  
7 2022. *Netflix, Inc. v. Valjakka*, IPR2022-01568, Paper 2 (P.T.A.B. Sep. 23, 2022) and a petition  
8 for inter partes review of the '102 patent on January 3, 2023. *Netflix, Inc. v. Valjakka*, IPR2023-  
9 00423, Paper 2 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 2, 2023).

10 On August 7, 2023, the PTAB denied Netflix's petition for IPR on the Lauri Valjakka's  
11 US'102 Patent and, on March 18, 2024, the PTAB terminated the IPR and denied Netflix's request  
12 to enter an adverse judgment against patent owner of the US'167 Patent, Lauri Valjakka.

13 **XI. RELIEF**

14 Netflix respectfully asks that this Court find at summary judgment that Valjakka  
15 committed fraudulent transfers in violation of the CUVTA and order Valjakka to continue to hold  
16 the Enforcement Assets pending adjudication of Netflix's forthcoming attorneys' fees motion.

17 **XII. EXPEDITED TRIAL PROCEDURE**

18 The case is set for trial on January 12, 2026.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 **XIII. SCHEDULE**

2 The Court ordered a revised schedule on July 11, 2025 (Dkt. 325, excerpted below):

Event	Deadline
Dispositive motion hearing deadline	October 2, 2025
Pretrial conference statement due	December 5, 2025
Pretrial conference	December 12, 2025 at 2:00 p.m.
Trial	January 12, 2026 at 8:00 a.m.
Estimate of trial length (in days)	Four

12 **XIV. TRIAL**

13 Both Parties have requested a trial by jury. The CUVTA issue should be triable in 1-2  
14 days.

15 **XV. DISCLOSURE OF NON-PARTY INTERESTED ENTITIES OR PERSONS**

16 On April 27, 2022, Valjakka filed a Certificate of Interested Parties and Entities pursuant  
17 to Civil Local Rule 3-15. (ECF No. 36).

18 On April 26, 2022, Netflix filed a Certificate of Interested Parties and Entities pursuant to  
19 Civil Local Rule 3-15. (ECF No. 34).

20 On September 21, 2023, Valjakka filed aa Amended Certificate of Interested Parties and  
21 Entities pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-15. (ECF No. 174).

22 **XVI. PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT**

23 All attorneys of record for the Parties have reviewed the Guidelines for Professional  
24 Conduct for the Northern District of California.

1 Dated: September 16, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

2 PERKINS COIE, LLP

3 /s/ Sarah E. Piepmeier

4 Sarah E. Piepmeier, Bar No. 227094  
5 SPiepmeier@perkinscoie.com  
6 Elise Edlin, Bar No. 293756  
7 EEdlin@perkinscoie.com  
8 PERKINS COIE LLP  
9 505 Howard Street, Suite 1000  
10 San Francisco, California 94105  
11 Telephone: +1.415.344.7000  
12 Facsimile: +1.415.344.7050

13 Janice L. Ta (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
14 JTa@perkinscoie.com  
15 PERKINS COIE LLP  
16 405 Colorado Street Suite 1700  
17 Austin, Texas 78701  
18 Telephone: +1.737.256.6100  
19 Facsimile: +1.737.256.6300

20 Adam Hester, Bar No. 311206  
21 PERKINS COIE LLP  
22 33 E. Main Street, Ste. 201  
23 Madison, Wisconsin, 53703  
24 AHeester@perkinscoie.com  
25 Telephone: +650.838.4311

26 Rachael D. Lamkin (SBN 246066)  
27 Karan Singh Dhadialla (SBN 296313)  
28 BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
101 California Street, Suite 3200  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Tel: (415) 291-6200  
Fax: (415) 291-6300  
rachael.lamkin@bakerbotts.com  
karan.dhadialla@bakerbotts.com

**Attorney for Defendant Netflix, Inc.**

22 Dated: September 16, 2025

23 /s/ William P. Ramey, III

24 William P. Ramey, III  
25 RAMEY LLP  
26 5020 Montrose Blvd., Suite 800  
27 Houston, Texas 77006  
28 wramey@rameyfirm.com

**WILLIAM RAMEY**

1 Dated: September 16, 2025

2 /s/ Lauri Valjakka

3 Laurio Valjakka (pro se)

4 Arinakatu 2 B38

5 FI 53100 Lappeenranta

6 Finland

7 +358 50 467 0090

8 lauri.valjakka@eezykeyz.fi

9

10 *LAURI VALJAKKA, Pro Se*

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

**SIGNATURE ATTESTATION**

I, Sarah E. Piepmeier, am the ECF user whose user id and password authorizes the filing of this documents. Under Civil L.R. 5-1(h)(3), I attest that counsel for Plaintiff has concurred in this filing.

Dated: September 16, 2025

*/s/ Sarah E. Piepmeier*

Sarah E. Piepmeier, CA SBN 227094

*Attorney for Defendant Netflix, Inc.*

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28